

NCO-41-SF - FORCE PROTECTION (WATERSIDE) PLANNING EXERCISE

PURPOSE

Evaluate ship's ability to plan for and prepare a Force Protection Plan to counter a potential terrorist threat originating from the surrounding water while the ship is moored to a pier or a buoy or at anchor.

This exercise may be conducted in conjunction with NCO-39-SF, FORCE PROTECTION (PIERSIDE) PLANNING EXERCISE, to create a more complete scenario.

When conducted on a repetitive basis, the exercise scenario should be different enough between iterations to ensure that each planning effort requires a fresh start.

This exercise should be conducted using TM SWDG 3-20.4-01, Surface Ship Force Protection in an Asymmetrical Environment.

REQUIREMENTS

A trusted agent cell, either the ship's own FP training team or an assist team from another command, which will provide a scenario with appropriate intelligence to stimulate the exercise ship's planning response.

PROCEDURES

OCE

1. Designate trusted agent cell. The cell should have the requisite expertise to plan a realistic scenario. Outside assistance from activities with FP knowledge should be exploited where available.
2. Provide scenario to exercise ship no later than 24 hours prior to time completed plan is due from exercise ship.
3. Evaluate exercise based on evaluation section below.

EXERCISE SHIP

1. Prepare FP plan appropriate to provided scenario.
2. Provide completed Force Protection Plan to OCE at directed time.

SAFETY

In preparing a scenario-based exercise of this type, imagination and ingenuity are important ingredients in making the exercise realistic and the training effective. However, the OCE and CO of the exercise ship must ensure that these efforts do not create potential safety problems. In all cases the use of force will be simulated. Operational Risk Management will be used to evaluate intrusion plans to assure a safe environment is maintained.

EVALUATION

GENERAL

1. Was FP plan appropriate to scenario?
2. If applicable, did FP plan include provision to include/incorporate host nation support/liaison?
3. Were internal and external communications effective?
4. Were appropriate external reports made?

PERIMETER

1. Was ship's FP perimeter defined, demarcated and defended?
2. Did plan address visual indication of perimeter limits to FP personnel?
3. Did plan include tripwires?
4. Did plan include manning topsides with sentries?
5. Did plan address sentry requirements for body armor, appropriate weapons, radios and whistles?
6. Did plan cover warning procedures for topside sentries?

7. Did the FP plan include the use of floating barriers, such as camels, logs or log booms, nets, if available.
8. Did FP plan include the use of active sonar, movement of rudders and screws, and use of concussion grenades (Mk 3a2)?

SECURITY BOAT PROCEDURES

1. Were security boats included in FP plan?
2. Did FP plan provide for two security force personnel, in addition to the boat crew, for visual coverage, FP force communications, warnings and use of force actions?
3. Did FP plan address training for coxswains in close quarter conning, including shouldering and blocking tactics?
4. Does the FP plan incorporate the use of drag lines from boats as an anti-swimmer tactic?
5. Did FP boat plan provide for overlapping coverage consistent with the amount of waterside access to the ship and the amount of small boat traffic in the area?
6. Did FP plan address communications requirements between ship and boats?
7. Did FP plan ensure that boat crew reliefs were staggered to prevent gaps in coverage.

SEARCH PROCEDURES

1. Did FP plan include designating a central search/inspection point pierside at a location outside the minimum standoff zone but within visual range of topside personnel in order to inspect/search vessels planned to come alongside (port service craft, ship chandler craft, etc.)?
2. If pierside inspections are not possible, does FP plan include "point of origin" searches or water-borne searches for these vessels?
3. Did plan provide for communication between the ship and the search location?
4. Did plan describe how search procedures were to be conducted?

WARNING PROCEDURES

1. Did FP plan include the use of radio, amplified voice, lights and flares to warn surface craft?
2. Did FP plan describe how second warnings were to be conducted; i.e., include statement that failure to comply will result in employment of defensive measures?

WEAPONS EMPLOYMENT

1. Did plan include requirement that personnel carrying weapons be PQS qualified on weapons carried?
2. Did plan require all personnel carrying weapons to be trained in the use of deadly force?
3. Did plan address effective deployment of small arms; i.e., appropriate for threat direction, overlapping fields of fire and 360 degree protection?
4. Did plan address types of fire to be employed and tactics for engaging vehicles and personnel?
5. Did plan address need to be alert, in the event of an attack, for the possibility of a second attack from a different axis?
6. Were crew-served weapons on ship included in plan?
7. Did FP plan include coordination of use-of-force plans with local authorities?

USE OF LIGHTING

1. Did plan require deck edge lighting?
2. If moored to pier, did plan require lighting to illuminate area under the pier?

NON-LETHAL METHODS

1. Did FP plan include the use of non-lethal methods, where appropriate?

